

**REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action dated September 11, 2007, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the attached amendment and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented herein are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-3, 7-9, 11, 13-18, 33, 36 and 39 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 11, 13 and 33 have been amended. No new matter has been added by the amendments. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of claims 1-3, 7-9, 11, 13-18, 33, 36 and 39 based upon the amendments and at least the following remarks.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

In order for an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art; that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references; and that the proposed modification of the prior art must have had a reasonable expectation of success, determined from the vantage point of the skilled artisan at the time the invention was made. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996). See MPEP 2143.

Claims 1-3, 7-9, 11, 36 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Kawano et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,985,194, hereinafter “Kawano”) in view of Tsutomu (Japanese Patent No. 2001-296523, hereinafter “Tsutomu”). The Examiner states that Kawano discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims except *the display device comprising a plurality of pixels including color pixels and a white pixel*, which the Examiner further states is disclosed primarily in FIG. 1 of Tsutomu. Applicant respectfully traverses for at least the following reasons.

The Examiner states that Kawano discloses all of the elements of claim 1 except, *the display device comprising a plurality of pixels including color pixels and a white pixel*, which the Examiner further states is disclosed primarily in FIG. 1 of Tsutomu.

It is respectfully submitted, however, that neither Kawano nor Tsutomu teach or suggest *the second line width of the second portion of at least one of the gate lines and the data lines of the white pixel is larger than the width of other portions of the respective gate and data lines of the other pixels*, as in amended independent claim 1.

For example, the respective first and second larger line widths of the gate and/or data lines the Examiner describes on pages 3 and 4 of the Office action are clearly associated with *each* pixel of the display device substrate, as shown in FIGS. 1, 2, 5 and 6 of Kawano (e.g., items 5-1 and 5-2). There is no teaching or suggestion to vary the respective first or second line widths associated only with certain pixels.

Turning to Tsutomu, there is no teaching or suggestion to vary any widths of either the gate lines or data lines (nor has the Examiner alleged this).

Thus, neither Kawano nor Tsutomu teach or suggest *wherein the second line width of the second portion of at least one of the gate lines and the data lines of the white pixel is larger than the width of other portions of the respective gate and data lines of the color pixels* as in amended claim 1 of the present invention.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 2-3, 7-9, 11 and 36, of the present invention are patentable over the cited references.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-3, 7-9, 11, 36 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 13 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Kawano in view of Tanioka (U.S. Patent No. 5,929,843, hereinafter “Tanioka”). Applicant respectfully traverses for at least the following reasons.

The Examiner states that Kawano discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims except, *a device and method comprising a plurality of dots each dot including red, green, blue and white pixels, the device comprising: a gate driver supplying the gate signals to the gate lines; a data driver supplying the data voltages to the data lines; and an image*

*signal modifier for converting three-color image signals into four-color image signals, optimizing the four-color image signals, and supplying the optimized image signals to the data driver such that the data driver converts the optimized image signals to the data voltages*, which the Examiner further states is disclosed primarily in FIGS. 1, 2 and 7 of Tanioka.

It is respectfully noted that independent claims 13 and 33 have been amended in the same manner as claim 1, discussed above. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that neither Kawano nor Tanioka teach or suggest wherein the second line width of the second portion of at least one of the gate lines and the data lines of the white pixel is larger than the width of other portions of the respective gate and data lines of the color pixels, as in amended claims 13 and 33.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 13 and 33, as well as claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 14-18, of the present invention are patentable over the cited references.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 13 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 14 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Kawano in view of Tanioka and further in view of Morita (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0196243, hereinafter “Morita”). Applicant respectfully traverses for at least the following reasons.

The Examiner states that Kawano in view of Tanioka discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims except, *supplying the image signals to the data driver in synchronization with a clock; and a clock generator generating the clock, the data driver operating in synchronization with the clock*, which the Examiner further states is disclosed primarily in paragraph 239 of Morita.

Independent claim 13, from which claims 14 and 18 depend, is submitted as being allowable for defining over Kawano in view of Tanioka, as discussed above.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that *supplying the image signals to the data driver in synchronization with a clock; and a clock generator generating the clock, the data driver operating in synchronization with the clock* as allegedly taught by Morita or any other

Application No. 10/659,593  
Response dated: November 9, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of September 11, 2007

disclosure of Morita does not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Kawano or Tanioka.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 14 and 18 of the present invention are patentable over the cited references.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 14 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 15-17 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's noting the allowable subject matter in claims 15-17, but Applicant respectfully submits that claims 15-17 are allowable as depending upon allowable independent claim 13. As such, Applicant has not rewritten claims 15-17 in independent form at this time.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing remarks distinguishing the prior art of record, Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is requested. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's Attorneys at the below-listed telephone number regarding this Amendment or otherwise regarding the present application in order to address any questions or remaining issues concerning the same. If there are any charges due in connection with this response, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /James J. Merrick/  
James J. Merrick 43,801  
Confirmation No. 5378  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Date: November 9, 2007